Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/899,432	KLEIMAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Shobha Kantamneni	1617	

	Shobha Kantamneni	1617		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 25 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.	
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07, Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was compared to the compared t	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since	
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) hey raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeat; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); tter form for appeal by materially red	E below); ducing or simplifying the		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	: lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the	
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>MONE</u> . Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>91-102</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		pe entered and an e.	Contraction of	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to common a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered to the filed after the date of filing entered filed after the date of fi	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).	
The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See page 2.	t does NOT place the application in	*		
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).			
/SREENI PADMANABHAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11:

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but not found persuasive. All the rejection made in the final office action are MAINTAINED.

Response to Applicant's Arguments:

Applicant argues that "It is well known that salts of long-chain fatty acids are less soluble in water as compared with shorter chain fatty acids salts, and therefore it would be unexpected that salts with chain lengths greater than 18 carbons would we similar and/or improved activity relative to the more-water-soluble materials, such as those materials suggested in Sintov et al." These arguments have been considered, but not found persuasive because the arguments are not commensurate with the instant claims. The instant claims do not limit to water as physiologically acceptable carrier in the instant claims can be water, alcohol etc. or mixtures of different solvents. The subulting of acroscylic acids with a different chain lengths in alcohol/water mixtures will be different from solubly in water.

Applicant argues that "Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has overlooked page 2 of the 37 CFR §1. 132 affidavits of Robert Kleiman and David Ashley, which clearly slate that "K100 refers to the combination of monounsaturated long an iaclobols, jobba-derived fatty acid salts, and fatty acid esters (specifically, jobba esters)." These arguments have been considered, but not found persuasive because jobba-derived fatty acid salts can be C18-fatty acid salt since C18-fatty acids are derived from jobal. Accordingly, is not clear as to which fatty acids salts are present in K100. Thus, the 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 Affidavits by Robert Kleiman and David Ashley have been considered, but not found persuasive. The declaration does not provide any information with respect to which sustaurated long chain alcohol, fatty acid salt, and ester are employed in the combination K100. Exhibit 1, and the amounts of individual components employed in the combination K100. Further, there is no data provided for the individual fatty acid salts, and esters. The declaration merely provides antiviral activity data for n-docosanol alone, and does not provide antiviral activity data for the individual fatty acid salts, and esters. Accordingly, the data is not convincing with respect to the symptistic effects of the combination of the present invention.